DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 427 UD 015 567

AUTHOR Cohn, Marilyn R.; Finch, Mary Ellen
TITLE The Public Alternative High School: I. Solution to or Reflection of Societal Ills?
INSTITUTION Council on Anthropology and Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 9p.
JOURNAL CIT Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly; v6 n1 p9-16 Feb 1975

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; *Alternative Schools; Communication Problems; Decision Making; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Anthropology; *Educational Environment; *Educational Problems; Experimental Schools; Freedom Schools; High Schools; *High School Students; Interpersonal Problems; Open Education; Public Schools; Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS Missouri (Saint Louis)

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the results of a participant observation study conducted on two public alternative high schools in the St. Louis, Missouri metropolitan area. Phase I of the study consists of a literature-generated delineation of larger societal factors which create student unrest and give impetus to the development of alternative schools. Utilizing student and faculty interviews, the second phase derived three basic categories of concerns--curricular, bureaucratic-organizational, and interpersonal. The final phase of the study uses direct observation of three levels of complexity: the physical setting, the programmatic regularities, the analytic description. These are described in detail and analyzed. Four tensions confronting the alternative schools studied are identified as having as a shared theme the larger issues of the individual versus society. The alternative school is refused endorsement as a forerunner of the future. Students are encouraged to participate in these settings, but until a balance which promotes individual freedom along with group responsibility is achieved, it is held that its potential as a serious contribution to American education cannot be judged. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

FEB 27 1975

COUNCIL on ANTHROPOLOGY and EDUCATION QUARTERLY

Vol. VI, No. 1 February 1975

ED113427

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council on Anthropology and Education, D.C.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

THE PUBLIC ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOL: A SOLUTION TO OR REFLECTION OF SOCIETAL ILLS?

Marilyn R. Cohn
Washington University

Mary Ellen Finch
Maryville College

UD 015 567

Introduction

Despite innumerable attempts at educational innovation in recent years, increasing numbers of students and teachers have become so disaffected with secondary education in America that they have struck out on their own to create a drastically different educational setting–the public alternative high school.[2] In order to determine what stance, if any, we as teacher-educators ought to take toward this latest change effort, the authors engaged in a participant observation study[3] of two public alternative high schools in the St. Louis metropolitan area. A brief summary of the study and a more detailed description and analysis of the findings will be the focus of this article.

Perspective: Societal Critics

Phase One of the investigation was an attempt to delineate, through a reading of current sociological essays, some of the larger societal factors which might have created student unrest and given impetus to the development of alternative schools. In reviewing the recent literature, we found some suggesting that the need for highly trained personnel in our technological society clashes directly with the individual's need for personal integrity, and that since schools are presently geared more toward efficiency than toward individual fulfillment, serious student dissatisfaction results (Wirth, 1971; Toffler, 1970). Others link the discontent of young people more directly with the notion that in modern

American schools students have been separated from meaningful work or responsibility and consequently feel alienated from the real world (Wynn, 1971; Coleman, 1972). And, of course, we found a few such as Illich and Reimer arguing that schools and learning are simply incompatible and advocating instead the complete deschooling of society. Most societal critics we read, however, seem committed to the existence of our public school system, but strongly advocate changes of a substantive and sweeping nature in order to meet the needs of individual survival in today's society. Fantini (1970), for example, recommends public schools of choice in which governance is assumed by parents and community, the curriculum is "humanistically" oriented, and the range of personnel is widened to include students themselves, parents, community residents, and specialists. In addition, Toffler (1970) suggests dispersal, decentralization, interpenetration within the community, ad hocratic administration, a breakup of the rigid system of scheduling and grouping, temporary curricula, and required training in only the following three skills: learning how to learn, relating, and choosing. Armed, then, with some ideas concerning factors leading to educational unrest as well as some recommendations for change, we turned next to the participants of two public alternative high schools, for they were indeed educational discontents immersed in operationalizing change efforts of considerable magnitude.

Perspective: The Participants

In the second phase of the study, interviews constituted the primary source of data. Taking a cue from Sarason (1971), we assumed there were existing regularities in each of the two traditional schools[4] which might be reasons why students, teachers, and administrators chose to develop and/or work in the alternative school. Using Sarason's framework of regularities as a guide for our interviews, we asked the following questions of our informants:

(1) What was it about the traditional school that caused you to become involved in the alternative school?

(2) In what ways does your alternative school improve upon the programs you have seen in the traditional school?

The 16 faculty members interviewed comprised the total staffs from the two alterantive schools. Students were selected on the basis of recommendations by faculty members in response to our requests for a "representative sample." They may be loosely categorized in the terms of the Stonington counselor, who explained:

One-third are the highly motivated types, one-third are the "john brigade" and one-third are the type who cut the traditional school classes altogether.

Although students and faculty were interviewed separately, we soon discovered the regularities which concerned them were of a similar nature, and thus we have grouped them into three basic categories: curricular, bureaucratic-organizational, and interpersonal (student-student, student-teacher).

In the area of curricular concerns, for example, students complained that classes were routine, boring, and irrelevant, and that they had no voice in determining what they studied. Teachers, similarly, viewed traditional coursework as irrelevant for the students and the school day as too routinized. They also expressed the desire to teach courses of their own design and interest, while at the same time stating the belief that the "curriculum should flow from the kids."

In the realm of bureaucratic-organizational regularities, students complained about the size of their classes as well as the size of the whole school, the tightness of the scheduling, the oppressiveness of the authority structure, the abundance of "red tape," and the unfairness of the grading system. Teachers echoed student concern on class size and added complaints regarding procedures which prevented mobility (for student and teacher alike), and teaching assignments which failed to fit interests or time constraints. For example, many teachers felt "locked into time slots," and found it highly difficult to arrange significant learning experiences in blocks of 50 minutes, and nearly impossible to respond in a "helping" way to those who needed special assistance.

In the third area, that of interpersonal concerns, students and faculty alike commented that the organizational constraints prevented "meaningful" relationships from developing in the classroom or in the total school context. Teachers, for example, often mentioned with dislike an outmoded school structure which forced students and faculty members to play "traditional roles which are dishonest, superficial, and unequal." Thus, in summary, it appeared that disaffected teachers share in large part the complaints cited again and again by disaffected students.

Although we were quite surprised to discover from our data the congruency of feelings and attitudes shared by faculty and students from two different alternative schools toward the same programmatic regularities of the traditional schools, we were even more startled by the later realization that the teachers alone expressed one additional category of concern that we felt belonged more appropriately to the students. Many teachers seemed to deplore the lack of decision-making power in the hands of the students in relation to their own school

governance, and often spoke disparagingly of a system that perpetuates the authoritarian roles of teachers and the subservient roles of students. What seems so intriguing to us is that it is the teachers, not the students (at least, not the students we interviewed), who are protesting so vehemently over the lack of decision-making powers of young people in regard to the governance of the schools.

Perspective: The Authors

Now that we had the general background of educational unrest from the perspective of societal critics, and also some notions from the perspective of the participants themselves as to what kinds of concerns alternative school people were attempting to grapple with, we were eager to move into the settings in order to determine from our own perspective whether these schools had, in fact, created new regularities to meet some of the aforementioned concerns. Therefore, the final phase of the study used direct observation, and the remainder of our discussion will present a more detailed description and analysis of our observational findings on three levels of complexity—the physical, the programmatic, and the analytical.

Description: The Physical Settings

Perhaps what first strikes the uninitiated observer of alternative schools is the distinctly different appearance of the schools—often outside as well as in. Millbrook and Stonington High Schools are no exception. Millbrook, for example, was located (after several moves) in an abandoned supermarket consisting of one huge warehouse-type room divided only by hastily assembled partitions—blackboards, bookcases, or sheets of carboard. The frozen food locker became the art room, the office loft of the grocery store housed the one desk and telephone used by all faculty members, "attic variety" furniture appeared, and the noise level, due to poor acoustics and a warm weather ceiling fan, was several decibels above the comfort level (at least, to these observers).

Stonington, on the other hand, was housed in an unused elementary school. It, too, consisted of one large room (the former library) with a stage at one end which was co-opted by the students as a lounge area replete with saggy couch and chairs. Some classes and small group activities were held in corners of the room or in the corridors, but most were held out in the community in a variety of settings.

The usual scene at both schools consisted of students coming and going, working on some individual project, playing board games, or simply sitting and talking. These, then, were our settings, as well as the settings of the alternative school students and teachers, and it was here that we focused our observations in order to ascertain what new regularities had been created to meet the needs of the participants.

Description: Programmatic Regularities

In the realm of curriculum, we found a wide range of options available to students in three major areas. First, instead of only taking assigned or required courses, we found students selecting, creating, and in some instances teaching courses of their own choice. Second, students were actively encouraged to enter the community for academic resources, for volunteer-type activities, and for job geared to vocational training as well. Finally, we found that other outside learning experiences, ranging from music lessons to trips abroad to lectures at nearby colleges, had become legitimate components of the curriculum.

In the area of interpersonal relations we found several new programmatic regularities. Encounter sessions, small group activities (student affairs groups and group advisories), and individual counseling sessions were consciously built into the framework of students' programs. Further, we observed that the teachers and administrators were attempting to eliminate the traditional roles of teacher and student by being on a first-name basis with everyone, and by attempting to engage students as equals in the planning, operationalizing, and evaluating of many matters. In addition, the purposeful creation of loose and flexible scheduling generally enabled everyone to have more time to simply relax and chat informally together.

Lastly, we found several newly instituted regularities in the organizational-bureaucratic realm. Class size had been reduced, bureaucratic red tape eliminated to allow increased mobility for students and teachers, and rigid rules and formal edicts of any kind seemed non-existent. In place of traditional organizational regularities, we found decision making in the hands of large groups (town meetings at Stonington) or small groups (student affairs groups at Millbrook) comprised of teachers, students, and administrators, all functioning more or less as equals.

Thus, both from what we were able to learn from our observations and from what we gleaned from our interviews, we found many new programmatic regularities had been instituted in the two schools under study.

Description: Analytic

In the first description we briefly directed our attention to the physical description of our settings. In the second we raised the level of description by looking at the alternative schools in terms of the programmatic regularities instituted. If these new regularities had been all we had seen, then our study would have been a "neat and tidy" one. But that's not all we saw. We saw, in fact, a great deal more and, in order to describe it, we are forced to increase the complexity of our description even further. At this point we must proceed to what we shall call an analytical level of description.

As we examined our data, we saw that some of the newly instituted programmatic regularities based upon some of the fundamental assumptions of the two alternative schools under study seem to conflict with each other and to create, therefore, a series of dilemmas which the participants may not be fully aware of. In fact, it soon became apparent that perhaps the most fruitful framework for describing what the data revealed was that of a tension conflict model (Berlak et al., 1974). This final section of description, therefore, will be a more analytic attempt to describe what else we saw in terms of tensions which need to be consciously faced and ultimately resolved.

As we analyzed the interview data we were struck, first of all, by the fact (which we briefly alluded to earlier) that while all the teachers discussed their dissatisfaction with the traditional schools largely in terms of the lack of student rights, the students themselves were not, oddly enough, complaining about their lack of decision-making in the area of governance. Students complained about traditional schools, all right–they complained about the superficial and artificial relationships between students and teachers, and they complained about the irrelevance of the curriculum, but not one of the 25 spoke with hostility about their lack of organizational power in terms of governance. This fact raised in our minds the possibility that the whole complex issue of student rights and decision-making might not be a legitimate one in terms of student needs, and may in fact exist mainly in the minds of teachers. While the students appeared only to be demonstrating concern with personal decision making powers, the teachers and administrators, on the other hand, often spoke of the need to give group leadership experiences to the students. Teachers spoke of the alternative school as a perfect opportunity for students to develop an awareness of the decision-making process, as well as a place where they might begin to govern themselves. However, while students were welcomed and encouraged to attend meetings and participate in total school decision making, few availed themselves of this opportunity. Is it possible that while students are seriously searching for more meaning, both in their interpersonal relationships and in their courses of study, they are not desirous of powers relating to the governance of the entire group? Could it be that they are only interested in matters that relate to them personally? The fact that on the one hand students from the two schools under study, as well as others, are asking for decision making powers in the personal realm (such as the freedom to design one's own course of study), yet on the other hand are neither asking for nor accepting responsibility for total school governance, leads us to conceptualize the first dilemma confronting alternative school participants as one of *personal decision-making power vs. institutional decision-making power.*

We wish to stress at this point the complexity of the decision-making dilemma and to acknowledge our realization of the multitude of factors that can contribute to the understanding of this problem (Wilson, 1972). Nevertheless, analysis of our data clearly points to this particular conflict between the students' ethic of "do your own thing" and the teachers' adherence to the principles of democratic decision-making in matters of school governance. We think, therefore, that the tensions which result in the dilemma of personal decision-making power vs. institutional decision-making power need to be explored more carefully. If the teachers are to any great degree unconsciously exaggerating students' desire to govern themselves; or are simply projecting that need mainly from their own perspective instead of that of the students; or, most importantly, are misreading and misinterpreting the desires of the students for personal autonomy as demands for group decision-making power; then some of the decision-making components of alternative schools might need to be reconceptualized, especially in light of already documented decision-making disappointments.

A second interesting tension which became apparent as we examined our data, and which we feel needs conscious resolution, is the possible conflict in the *desire for freedom in the curricular realm on the part of the students as well as the teachers.* On the one hand, as we digested what the students were saying, we realized that they were asking for freedom to suggest and design courses that were relevant for them. They have requested fascinating courses that range, for example, from vegetarian cookery to Russian, from ham radio to youth and the law, from glassblowing to anthropology. On the other hand, we heard teachers saying that one of their dissatisfactions with traditional schools had been that they had been "required" to teach courses they didn't wish to teach. They, like the students, want freedom to teach (rather than learn) what interests them. Of course, if there is congruence between student desires to determine their own course of study and teacher desires for freedom to teach according to their interests and abilities, then the needs of both will be met, leading to greater interest, involvement, and eventual satisfaction with school life. The concern we have is what the consequences will be if the two don't mesh and a conflict develops. Students may want courses in Transcendental Meditation, Black Theatre, or Zen, and the faculty may well be interested in other areas or feel unprepared in those of greatest student interest. The tendency will be, and has been in fact, to then look for outside sources in the community to teach what is desired; while that is in many respects a desirable and, in fact, an intended, outcome of alternative schools, it generates another whole series of issues the alternative school must confront.

For example, if outside personnel are used, what criteria are used for selection and how will the schools monitor these courses? If these issues are ignored in an attempt to be relevant, the end result may be a curriculum which initially caters to students' interests but which may be of questionable quality and ultimately result in student disinterest.

If, on the other hand, alternative schools are either unwilling or unable to hire outside experts, the consequences are equally as problematic. Teachers whose expertise or interest lead them, for example, to offer courses in Black Poetry, Interior Decorating, or Russian may find themselves with virtually empty classrooms.

Finally, for the few students who reject already organized coursework taught by either "inside" or "outside" personnel and seek sponsors for independent projects, there are problems as well. Qualified sponsors may be unwilling or unable to handle individual assignments, due to the press of time, and unqualified sponsors will ultimately lead to dissatisfaction for all involved.

Thus, in looking at our two schools, we suspect that conflicts in curriculum development may be an issue that has not been fully expressed or explored, and that alternative schools need to recognize the problem inherent in everyone's desire to "do his own thing" in the area of curriculum, and to begin finding satisfactory resolutions to these "freedom" tensions.

A third insight we had during our study which was not specifically mentioned by the teachers, but which we drew from both our direct observations and from unsolicited remarks during teacher interviews, was that the role of the teacher in the alternative school was not only considerably different from a "traditional" teacher role but also quite a bit more difficult. In trying to come to grips with this new role and its differences and its difficulties, we found Smith and Keith's (1971) detailed analysis of staff sentiment at Kensington School extremely helpful. It seemed to us that, for the most part, the teachers we talked to at the alternative schools could be characterized more or less (like the Kensington teachers) by what Eric Hoffer calls the "True Believer–the man of fanatical faith who is ready to sacrifice his life for a holy cause."

Further, Smith and Keith's reference to Klapp's analysis of the nature of crusaders sheds additional light on our study of the "true believer." According to Klapp, a crusade may be "any remedial enterprise undertaken with zeal and enthusiasm," and that definition fits quite closely our view of the alternative schools. Thus, as we see it, the teacher role at the alternative school is different and more complex primarily because the sentiment of true belief functions among the staff in such a way that faculty members are also crusaders.

In order to understand the implications that the concept of "true belief" might have for alternative schools, and to comprehend the tensions it can create, one needs to examine its components. According to Smith and Keith, one of the components of "true belief" is "total commitment," for true believers totally commit their time, energy, and skills to the organization far beyond the call of duty, and thus "satisfaction and rewards that typically come from investing time and energy in family, friends, church, clubs, community service, hobbies, and recreational pursuits are relinquished and diverted into the organization." We found this to be exactly the case with the alternative school personnel. Because they are highly enthusiastic about the opportunity to remedy past ills, and because they are so deeply committed to meeting *all* needs of students, academic and other, with emphasis on other, their school days begin very early and end late at night. In other words, they seem almost completely consumed by their work.

A second component of the "true belief" sentiment that we found particularly applicable to alternative school teachers is what Smith and Keith call "high aspirations." Most of the teachers we interviewed, like those at Kensington, had opted for a strategy referred to as the "alternative of grandeur," which means they were dedicated to making pervasive changes that would sweepingly affect the whole of American education. From the objectives stated in the formal doctrines to the goals set by individual teachers, we found the continual expression of exceedingly high aspirations. Therefore, their tasks "involved extraordinary expenditures of time, effort, creativity and loyalty." Thus, while teachers are still responsible for daily classroom planning, they are also actively accepting responsibility for developing curriculum, making community contacts, counseling, creating necessary procedures, and making governance decisions as well.

These overwhelming responsibilities stemming from the true belief conviction cannot easily be operationalized. The lack of resources–time, energy, skills, and bureaucratic procedures–as well as the burden they carry in fighting their way out of their former roles all conspire against the satisfactory fulfillment of total commitment and high aspiration. The question we feel compelled to raise, and which we think our two groups of alternative school personnel must ask, is: Can the dilemma of *high aspiration and total commitment vs. lack of resources* be resolved satisfactorily?

A fourth and final tension we suggest as needing resolution actually arises from all three of the previously stated dilemmas. We found the faculties of both schools strongly commited to democratic decison-making for both themselves and for their students. Because they once so strongly objected to the bureaucracy of the traditional school and naturally fear its recurrence in the alternative school, we found both the principals and the teachers reluctant to exercise or even press for much

ultimate authority in decision-making or to institute any procedures that might facilitate consensus. The result was considerable pressure upon the teachers to resolve, by themselves, the generally complex philosophical and practical issues that divide them.

We also found, as stated earlier, that individual faculty members have their own conceptions of what they could or should teach. This strong desire for individual freedom among the teachers actually prevented consensus on what would comprise a relevant yet purposeful curriculum in the alternative schools, as well as on such mundane but crucial considerations as the basis upon which credit should be awarded or even what constitutes legitimate coursework.

Finally, we suggest that the true belief components of "high aspirations" and "total commitment" foster in individuals divergent and grandiose thinking about what the nature of education ought to be, as well as a deep commitment to the implementation of their own personal conception of the alternative school idea. Therefore, it is not easy for these people to compromise or seek consensus on any issue.

As a result of these three interrelated tensions, a final dilemma is generated: *individual conviction on processes and goals vs. group consensus on processes and goals.* We see the alternative school faculties of both schools under study as united both by feelings of alienation regarding traditional schools and their shared beliefs concerning democratic decision-making, freedom of the individual, and total commitment and high aspirations for the "cause." But we see them also being torn apart by the very consequences of these shared beliefs. We therefore find that without consensus there had been no developed common methodology to achieve their goals, no agreement even about what those goals should be, and no common language with which to explore the problem. Thus, we feel compelled to pose one last question: Can these independent-thinking, deeply committed teachers, through an open sharing of ideas, develop by themselves a workable, livable methodology for defining and achieving their fundamental processes and outcome goals?

Conclusions

On the one hand, because the scope of our study was a narrow one, and because our acquaintance with educational alternatives had a local emphasis, we were fearful of generalizing from our N of 2. On the other hand, since our positions at the university literally demanded from us some decision-making concerning alternative schools, we felt compelled to look at our data with an eye toward assessing the potential of the alternative school idea in general as a serious contribution to American education. So we conclude with our attempt to answer our own original question: As teacher-educators, what stance should we take? In weighing the relative strengths observed against the weaknesses witnessed, it eventually became clear that at the heart was the original issue noted at the outset—that of the individual versus society.

As we have described it throughout this article, the source of the alternative school idea and the way it has been operationalized was an attempt to meet the individual's need for personal integrity and fulfillment within a highly organized technical society or, as it translates into the school context, the needs of individuals within a large, impersonal school organization. The efforts of alternative schools to establish a more flexible and varied curriculum, more opportunities for closer interpersonal ties, and fewer bureaucratic structures go a long way toward meeting the needs of individuals. The alternative school idea embodies Fantini's (1970) suggestions for more parental and community governance, a more "humanistically" oriented curriculum, and the widening of the range of teaching personnel to include parents, students, and community residents. It attempts, as Toffler (1970) recommends, to break up the rigid system of scheduling and grouping, to institute temporary curricula, and to stress the development of skills such as learning how to learn, relating, and choosing. Finally, it places some emphasis on the productive aspect of community work that Coleman (1972) so strongly suggests. Herein lies its strength.

But perhaps herein lies its weakness as well. As we analyzed the four tensions confronting our alternative schools, they all appeared to be, in one way or another, instances of the larger issue of the individual vs. society. Our decision-making dilemma described a conflict between the desire for personal decision-making power vs. the need for institutional decision-making power. The freedom to develop curriculum dilemma describes the conflict between the individual's desire for choice (both teachers and students) vs. the need for some sort of organizational or group control over curriculum. The true belief dilemma describes the "ideology" of individuals vs. the need for group problem solving in the face of limited resources. Finally, the processes and goals dilemma describes the conflict between the individual's convictions on the nature and methods of school goals vs. the need for group consensus on these same issues. It seems, therefore, that the newly instituted programmatic regularities which were designed to give the individual personal freedom now, as they have become operationalized actually ignore in many ways essential elements of group process. As we see it, the situation strangely enough has reversed itself. What gave rise to the alternative school was the need to protect and nurture the individual within the highly organized structure of society—the school. Now the very structure of the alternative school seems threatened by individualism carried to an extreme.

What stance, then, should we take? As teacher-educators, we reject the option of dismissing it as a fad because of its strengths. However, because of its weak-

nesses and because the issue of the individual vs. society is still with us (only in reverse), we refuse to endorse it as a forerunner of the future by redesigning teacher education programs for alternative schools. Therefore, the following will be our stance. We will encourage our students to participate in alternative school settings, and we will commit ourselves, as well as the resources of the university, to the alternative school movement in order to improve its chances for survival. But until a balance is achieved which promotes *individual freedom along with group responsibility*, we can make no final judgment about its potential as a serious contribution to American education.

****

NOTES

1. The Consortium for Options in Public Education has defined the public alternative school as "any school within a community that provides alternative learning experiences to the conventional school program and which is available by choice to every family in the community at no extra cost." The following types, or variation of the types, are listed: Open Schools, Schools Without Walls, Learning Centers, Continuation Schools, Multicultural Schools, Free Schools, and Schools Within Schools. See *Changing Schools*, No. 8, p. 3, Fall 1973, for descriptions.

2. See *Changing Schools*, Fall 1973, for graphic data of the growth of the alternative school movement.

3. In-depth interviews, direct observation, analysis of documents, and direct participation comprised the major methods of data collection.

4. Throughout this paper the term "traditional" school will refer to the regular public high school in a community, as opposed to the alternative public high school.

REFERENCES

Berlak, H., A. Berlak, N. Bagenstos, E. Mikel. "The Development of a Theoretical Orientation to Schooling Based on a Participant Observation Study of English Infant Primary Schools." St. Louis: Washington Univ., 1973 (unpublished).

Callahan, R. *Education and the Call of Efficiency.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1962.

Changing Schools. Bloomington IN: Educational Alternatives Project, Indiana Univ., Fall 1973.

Coleman, J. S. "The Children Have Outgrown the Schools." *Psychology Today*, February 1972.

Denzen, N. *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook.* Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1970.

Emrich, A. "Proseminar Paper No. 2." St. Louis: Washington Univ., 6 November 1972 (unpublished).

Fantini, M. D. "Educational Agenda for the 1970's: Public Schools." *Social Policy*, Nov.-Dec. 1970.

Gross, R. "After Deschooling, Free Learning." *Social Policy*, Jan.-Feb. 1972.

Homans, G. C. *The Human Group.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950.

Illich, I. "The Alternative to Schooling." *Saturday Review*, 19 June 1971.

Rossman, M. "How We Learn in America." *Saturday Review*, 19 August 1972.

Sarason, S. B. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1970.

Shucart, J. W. "The Alternative High School: A Re-Examination with Special Focus on Administration and Community." St. Louis: Washington Univ., 14 November 1972 (unpublished).

Smith, L. M., P. Keith. *Anatomy of an Educational Innovation.* New York: Wiley, 1971.

Toffler, A. *Future Shock.* New York: Random House, 1970.

Wirth, A. G. *Education in the Technological Society.* Scranton: Intext, 1972.

———. "Reflections on Disaffected Students." *The Educational Forum*, March 1971.

Wilson, S. "Strengthening Alternative Schools." *Harvard Educational Review*, August 1972.

Wynne, E. "Student Unrest Re-Examined." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1971.

Yankelovich, D. "The New Naturalism." *Saturday Review*, 1 April 1972.

The authors should be applauded for their exploration of innovative approaches to formal education. Many educators would simply dismiss procedures that either challenge existing routine or that seem to imply that they, the educators, will have to change. Three major aspects of the article should be addressed: methodology, findings due to different perspectives, and speculation on what can be done with the results as far as teachers of teachers are concerned. It would appear that the authors recognize the value of getting different perspectives on a single issue. If certain assumptions and procedures are not violated, two techniques potentially are better than one. In this case both the "insiders" (the participants) and the "outsiders" (the authors) are given input opportunity. But are the insiders given free rein to express their views? One could question whether the interviews permitted this, particularly noting the form of the questions.

The doubt raised above is reinforced by the final section of perspectives (Part III: The Authors). The use of Sarason's model of regularities was good, and did seemingly prove fruitful. Of particular insight was the analytical section. The authors' points were good, and certainly examine what are valid dilemmas, but are they truly dilemmas of the alternative schools or dilemmas of the authors' need for organizational structure? It is questionable if alternative schools and their goals as dilineated in the societal critics section need the same structure and interactional patterns that the authors seem to feel are necessary for group endeavors. Even if the dilemmas are real to alternative schools, are they any less real in traditional schools? What needs exploring are the media for dilemma resolution and conflict diminution in the alternative schools and, if present, in the traditional schools also.

Here is a worthwhile use of the alternative schools and the inclusion of their study into the education of future teachers. What type of interpersonal patterns are established in a humanistically-oriented institution such as alternative schools? What can be gleaned from these great experiments, whether they last or not?

The authors have contributed to the educational process by providing data and insights that go beyond common sense answers. Also, they provide a platform for further dialogue and research.

Richard L. Hovey

****

INVITATION FOR MANUSCRIPTS

The *Journal of Research and Development in Education* is a quarterly publication of the College of Education, University of Georgia, and is now in its seventh year of publication. We propose to develop for the journal an issue devoted to "Anthropology and Education." Our guest editors will be M. J. Rice, Professor of Social Science Education, and W. C. Bailey, Professor of Anthropology. This notice is an invitation for interested authors to submit manuscripts.

Articles submitted for consideration will be referred to a panel of readers. Suggested areas of coverage will include (1) school ethnographies; (2) teaching of anthropology; (3) applied anthropology–anthropology in development programs; (4) role of anthropology in training educators; (5) studies of schooling and enculturation; (6) studies of classroom processes; (7) studies of individual pupils and educators; (8) methods and theory in anthropology and education; (9) cross-cultural comparative studies; (10) language and learning.

All manuscripts should be sent to:
M. J. Rice,
Dept. of Social Science Education
University of Georgia
Athens GA 30602

CALL FOR PAPERS

The First Annual Meeting of the Association for the Anthropological Study of Play will be held 3-5 April 1975 at the Detroit Heritage Hotel, Detroit. TAASP will be meeting in conjunction with the Central States Anthropological Association's 54th Annual Meeting. Separate sessions will be held; however, convening with CSAA will provide an opportunity to exchange ideas with their members about our common interests. Plan now to join us!

Program Coordinator Phillips Stevens has issued the following message:

The following guidelines are set forth regarding the preparation and submission of papers for presentation at the TAASP Annual Meeting, 1975:

1. Papers should be geared to an oral presentation of not more than 20 minutes to allow time for discussion.

2. The deadline for submission of abstracts of papers is 1 February 1975. Abstracts of papers must be approved by the Program Committee.

3. Authors of papers should send abstracts of approximately 350 words to Prof. Phillips Stevens, Jr., TAASP Program Committee Coordinator, Dept. of Anthropology, SUNY-Buffalo, Buffalo NY 14226.

4. Any persons interested in organizing panels along specific topics should write Prof. Stevens. Panels will usually be limited to no more than four formal papers.